

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 171

EA 027 280

AUTHOR Harlen, Wynne
 TITLE Putting 5-14 in Place: An Overview of the Methods and Findings of the Evaluation 1991-1995. Interchange No. 35.
 INSTITUTION Scottish Office Education Dept., Edinburgh. Research and Intelligence Unit.
 REPORT NO ISSN-0969-613X
 PUB DATE 95
 NOTE 17p.; For the primary school implementation, Interchange No. 36, see EA 027 281; for the secondary school implementation, Interchange No. 37, see EA 027 282.
 AVAILABLE FROM SCRE, 15 St. John Street, Edinburgh EH8 8JR, Scotland, United Kingdom.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
 EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS *British National Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; English Instruction; Foreign Countries; *Guidelines; Mathematics Instruction; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation
 IDENTIFIERS *Scotland

ABSTRACT

The 5-14 Development Programme was a major reform encompassing the whole of the curriculum, assessment, national testing and reporting for students aged 5 to 14 years in Scotland. Between 1989 and 1993 national guidelines were developed for five curricular areas--English language, mathematics, environmental studies, expressive arts, and religious/moral education--and for personal and social development, reporting, assessment and national testing. This document describes findings of an evaluation of the 5-14 Development Programme. The evaluation involved four projects that were coordinated by the Scottish Council for Research in Education (SCRE). The evaluation was formative, longitudinal, and collaborative. Data were gathered from a questionnaire of about 120 secondary schools and 200 primary schools, and from site visits at 15 and 25 of the secondary and primary schools, respectively. Findings indicate that over time, teachers expressed increasing satisfaction as they became more comfortable with the 5-14 guidelines. Factors that inhibited the implementation process were time and resources. School staff made successful efforts to ensure that their programs matched the curricular guidelines. Implementation of the guidelines for English and mathematics instruction was initially time-consuming. As yet, the evaluation data give no clear evidence of the extent to which continuity and progression at the level of individual pupils were being achieved. (LMI)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *



THE SCOTTISH OFFICE
Education and Industry Department

ED 390 171

INTERCHANGE

No 35

**Putting 5-14 in Place:
An overview of the methods and findings
of the evaluation 1991-95**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- ☐ Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN
GRANTED BY

R. Wake

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Research and Intelligence Unit

ISSN 0969-613X

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 02 7280

Why Interchange?

Research cannot make the decisions for policy makers and others concerned with improving the quality of education in our schools and colleges. Nor can it by itself bring about change. However, it can create a better basis for decisions, by providing information and explanation about educational practice and by clarifying and challenging ideas and assumptions.

It is important that every opportunity should be taken to communicate research findings, both inside and outside The Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (SOEID). Moreover, if research is to have the greatest possible impact on policy and practice, the findings need to be presented in an accessible, interesting and attractive form to policy makers, teachers, lecturers, parents and employers.

Interchange aims to further improve the Research and Intelligence Unit's (RIU) dissemination of the findings of research funded by SOEID. We hope you will find that *Interchange* is long enough to give the flavour of the complexities, subtleties and limitations of a research study but concise enough to give a good feeling for the findings and in some cases to encourage you to obtain the full report.



The *Interchange* symbol invites you to reflect and respond to an issue or question posed by the research. You may wish to raise awareness by responding to each *Interchange* before reading the adjacent section of text. Alternatively, you may prefer to read the text first then review each *Interchange* to construct a personal summary of the issues.

Edited and produced for The Scottish Office Education and Industry Department by the RIU Dissemination Officer at The Scottish Council for Research in Education, November 1995.

Copyright © 1995, SOEID

Interchange may be photocopied for use within your own institution.

A limited number of additional copies can be obtained by writing to the RIU Dissemination Officer at: SCRE, 15 St John Street, Edinburgh EH8 8JR. File copies for electronic downloading will also be made available on the RIU World Wide Web Server, accessible through Internet and JANET (<http://www.ed.ac.uk/~riu>).

Putting 5-14 in Place: An overview of the methods and findings of the evaluation 1991-95

by Wynne Harlen

Scottish Council for Research in Education

Background

The evaluation programme reported here took the form of four projects, co-ordinated from the Scottish Council for Research in Education (SCRE). It was designed to follow the implementation over three years in the same two samples of schools. The evaluation had some significant features:

- *It was formative in function.* The evaluators saw their role as being to provide teachers, parents and others as well as the SOEID, with feedback about the progress and effects of the implementation of 5-14.
- *The separate projects were co-ordinated.* The four teams met regularly to plan the programme of data collection and research questions were identified for the programme as a whole, with each addressed by several of the projects.
- *It was longitudinal in design.* This was a particular strength in helping to distinguish between reactions to change as such and to the particular features of the 5-14 programme.
- *There was collaborative data collection among the projects.* Questionnaires and interviews were designed to collect information for all four projects, thus minimising the demands made on schools.

The 5-14 Development Programme was a major reform encompassing the whole of the curriculum, assessment, national testing and reporting for pupils of age 5 to 14 in Scotland. Between 1989 and 1993 national guidelines were developed for five curricular areas – *English language, mathematics, environmental studies, expressive arts and religious and moral education* – and for *personal and social development, reporting, assessment and national testing*. In each case draft guidelines were published in the form of a working paper for consultation before being revised in the light of comments and published as national guidelines between June 1991 and June 1993.

The pace of implementation of 5-14

Guidelines on English language, mathematics and assessment were the first to be published and implemented in schools. At that time, in 1991, there was no central guidance on the pace of implementation and the arrival of further guidelines whilst schools were coming to grips with the first ones caused teachers, particularly headteachers in primary schools, to feel to be under some pressure. This was reflected in the summary report of the first two years of the evaluation (Interchange No 23, Harlen et al, 1994).

However in January 1994 a document from Her Majesty's Inspectors, entitled *5-14: A Practical Guide* (SOED, 1994) proposed a timescale for implementation which reflected the pace of change that most schools were finding comfortable. This suggested that by the end of session 1994/95 all schools should have implemented the curriculum and assessment guidelines in English and mathematics and be using the 5-14 terminology and structure in their planning and reporting to parents in these subjects. Over the next four years the three remaining areas should be added, until the whole would be in place by the end of session 1998/99.

This timescale for implementation is relevant to the evaluation programme which collected information from session 1991/92 to 1994/95 and thus could report only the implementation of the first guidelines. In view of this the evaluation will continue, on a reduced scale, for a further two years from April 1995.

Design of the evaluation

The evaluation programme described here comprised a set of four projects based at different institutions. Initially the projects were concerned with:

- The guidelines on the curriculum and on assessment in the primary school (based at SCRE, Edinburgh)
- The guidelines on the curriculum and on assessment in the secondary school (based at Northern College, Aberdeen and Dundee campuses)
- The guidelines on reporting 5-14 (based at Jordanhill College of Education, later to become Strathclyde University Faculty of Education)
- Evaluation of the 5-14 programme test material and its use in the primary school (based at the University of Edinburgh)

A change was made in the focus of the fourth project, on the test material and its use, following the new arrangements for national testing introduced in 1993. Testing then ceased to be carried out for specific primary school year groups and became part of all teachers' roles in the primary and in the English and mathematics departments of secondary schools. It could therefore more easily be encompassed within the primary and secondary projects rather than treated separately. The opportunity was taken to switch the activity of the Edinburgh University team to study an aspect of the programme which had emerged as one of concern during the first two years of the evaluation, namely, the extent to which the 5-14 guidelines supported balanced, coherent and progressive curriculum provision for the most and the least able pupils.

A nationally representative sample, of about 120 secondary schools and 200 primary schools, was drawn for a questionnaire survey and a sub-sample of these (15 secondary schools and 25 primary schools) were visited to conduct interviews with staff and, on one occasion, parents. The questionnaire sample contained schools from all 12 Regional and Island Authorities, whilst the visit schools were in nine Authorities (excluding Shetland, The Western Isles and Dumfries and Galloway.)

Main Findings

The initial reception of any major development programme such as 5-14 is a mixture of reactions to the introduction of change itself as well as to the particular changes embodied in the new programme. The reaction to change *per se* may depend upon whether there have been other demands for change either

recently or concurrently, on the extent to which the change is thought to be needed and will bring benefits justifying the effort which is required, and whether those who have to implement it feel themselves to be in control or in the grip of external agencies. An evaluation which looks at an innovation for only a short period soon after its introduction has more difficulty in distinguishing between reactions to change as such and to the particular changes introduced than one which extends beyond the period where everything is new. Thus the longitudinal aspect of the 5-14 implementation evaluation is a particular strength which adds validity to its findings.

Initial reactions

At the start of the evaluation study, in 1991/92, primary teachers and head teachers expressed no strong views either of resistance to or of liking for the guidelines. Over time they expressed increasing satisfaction as they became more familiar with the content and initial difficulties with terminology were overcome. These views were formed by the implementation of the guidelines for English language and mathematics which dominated the attention of schools in the first two years of the evaluation study. In these areas of the curriculum teachers already had available a good deal of structured help from classroom materials and might be expected to be more satisfied with the current practice and hence more critical of change than in environmental studies, expressive arts and religious and moral education, where, in general, this was not the case. A cautious initial reaction to the English and mathematics guidelines was thus perhaps to be expected, as was the reaction that 'we're doing much of this already'. Towards the end of the evaluation period it became clear that schools had found more that needed changing in these core areas than they at first anticipated.

The structure provided by the guidelines was more obviously appreciated when primary schools began to consider the environmental studies guidelines in detail. Early indications were that these guidelines were perceived as of considerable help in making clear what was expected in this area and in planning topics to ensure all components were represented.

Implementation in secondary schools was generally slower to start than in primary schools, although once begun it could proceed more rapidly since English and mathematics departments worked in parallel rather than tackling one subject after the other, which was the usual pattern in primary schools. Thus the reactions gathered from secondary staff in 1991/92 were to the written documents and the potential for change, not the experience of beginning implementation. The advantages of 5-14 were seen at that time mainly in terms of better continuity from primary to secondary school, the clear structure of progression and the attention given to S1 and S2 work.

Disadvantages were concerned with workload, the amount of detail prescribed and, as in the case of primary teachers, the terminology and use of what was

Most teachers felt more comfortable with the 5-14 guidelines through working with them.



How useful do you find the 5-14 guidelines for curriculum planning?

considered to be jargon. There was considerable similarity in initial reactions and in subsequent change in views of primary and secondary school staff. A structure of outcomes, strands, targets and levels was being introduced in the curriculum for S1 and S2 for the first time, as it was for primary schools, a structure which it took time to understand and begin to use effectively in planning and evaluation. Reactions to 5-14 became noticeably more positive in most schools as this process proceeded.

The process of implementation

In both primary and secondary schools the following sequence of overlapping events could be discerned in the process of becoming familiar with and using the guidelines. At the whole school or department level:

- (i) study of the guidelines by a group or individual senior staff
- (ii) audit of school/department programme and resources in relation to the requirements of the guidelines
- (iii) development or revision of school or department policy to accommodate the guidelines
- (iv) forward plans of individual teachers required to reflect the guidelines
- (v) some new aspects of content introduced in classrooms
- (vi) new resources in place
- (vii) all staff planning matched to 5-14
- (viii) assessment and reporting guidelines in use.

In relation to guidelines other than those in English language and mathematics, few schools had proceeded beyond the first two points in this list by 1993/94 and thus implementation of 5-14 in these areas could be said to be no more than at the early stages.

At the individual teacher level the process was less formal:

- (i) dipping into the documents
- (ii) reflecting on current work with colleagues
- (iii) participating in in-school or regional in-service
- (iv) identifying new elements to be included in class work
- (v) adjusting forward planning to match 5-14
- (vi) introducing changes in classroom activities
- (vii) making changes in assessment and recording.

Factors assisting these processes were similar in primary and secondary schools although taking somewhat different forms, reflecting the differences in school structure. The main facilitating factors were school development planning, the operation of a cluster or area group and delegation of responsibility within the school. These points are reported in more detail in Interchange No 36 and No 37.

At the head of any list of factors inhibiting the pace of implementation must be

As part of the implementation process, schools initiated a range of activities.



How much have activities of the kind listed here contributed to your own progress in implementing 5-14?

time, which was mentioned repeatedly throughout the period of the evaluation and by all school staff. Apart from time, primary staff cited more resources (financial and human), print-based materials, and in-service courses as their main needs. Support provided to staff by the regional authorities was criticised in the early years of 5-14 but was found more helpful in later years. Locally or regionally produced materials were found of particular help. Most of the extensive support materials produced by the Scottish CCC became available only after the time of these enquiries.

Changes resulting from 5-14

In primary schools the changes already brought about (in 1994) or planned to take place in the near future, as a result of 5-14, in at least half of the schools were, in descending order of frequency:

- changed emphasis on existing content
- introduction of additional content
- replacement of previous content
- more resources in the classroom
- more subject-based teaching
- more collaborative lesson planning
- more collaborative teaching.

A majority of primary school staff did not consider that change was needed in the amount of group work, differentiation or the structure of lesson plans as current practice in these respects was considered to meet the 5-14 requirements.

In secondary schools the majority of mathematics and English teachers thought that any changes in content brought about by 5-14 were minor, comprising some filling of gaps and change of emphasis. It was differentiation which was the greatest concern to secondary staff. This was more so for English teachers than for mathematics teachers who considered it to be built into their schemes. English teachers were adopting a wider range of teaching approaches which would accommodate the requirements of 5-14.

Continuity at points of transition

The 5-14 Development Programme brought added impetus to existing efforts to improve primary-secondary continuity in pupils' progress. In the second year of the evaluation study there was evidence of all schools being involved in liaison activities, with most taking part in several different types of activity. Details of the nature and perceived success of various strategies seen from the perspectives of primary and secondary schools are given in Interchange No 36 and Interchange No 37 respectively.

Most strategies operated at the class or group level, that is, in terms of serving continuity in the general demand and type of work. Continuity for individual pupils depends on a match of demand to achievement at a more personal level.

The majority of primary school teachers felt that currently their group work, differentiation and lesson planning met 5-14 requirements.



With greater experience of the guidelines, what changes do you now think are needed if the programme is to be fully implemented?

English and mathematics teachers were more concerned about differentiation and how to achieve it than about making changes to curriculum content.



*How might differentiation be increased in your own subject?
Given that differentiation is important, what other changes are necessary?*

Individual pupil records passed from one school to another were an under-used resource.



Why do some teachers not use pupil records passed from feeder schools? What can be done to improve records and ensure that they are used?

Many teachers had more confidence in teaching the least able pupils than those who were more able.



Why do you think this is? What action by teachers and what help is needed if the more able pupils are to have work that will challenge them?

To achieve this means that information at this individual level has to be communicated and used. The evaluation indicated that individual records passed from one school to another were an under-used resource. Almost half of secondary mathematics teachers and the majority of English teachers did not refer to primary school records at all. Where they were used it was normally for the purpose of grouping pupils or to identify those likely to have particular needs. It was evident that considerably more time and ingenuity will be required to change attitudes and practices which favour a 'fresh start' at the individual pupil level. That this is not a matter of difference in attitude between primary and secondary teachers is shown by its appearance at transition from nursery to primary school. The criteria provided by 5-14 should in theory help to overcome the view that teachers' comments are too subjective and diverse to be useful, but the signs of change thus far are disappointingly small.

Catering for pupils of all abilities

It is the declared intention that the 5-14 programme should provide opportunities for pupils across the range of ability to learn from the full range of experiences indicated in the curriculum guidelines. The guidelines for each subject area include a section on catering for the needs of individual pupils in which the importance of differentiation is underlined. The study of how teachers were using 5-14 to cater for the least and most able pupils drew upon the questionnaire and interview data collected in late 1993 and early 1994 from primary and secondary schools, supplemented by focused case studies in a total of ten classrooms in three primary schools and one secondary school. Pupils identified by their teachers as being the least and most able were observed, completed short questionnaires and were interviewed in groups.

In general teachers had more confidence in dealing with the least able pupils than the most able. However, most teachers found some difficulty in using the guidelines to help the least able pupils. Not only did such pupils often have an uneven profile which did not fall within one level but the level A work made assumptions about previous experiences which did not always apply to pupils with learning difficulties. At the same time, it was recognised that the guidelines provided a structure which identified lines of progress useful in planning, although the levels were considered too broad and needed to be broken down to suit the slower pace of the least able pupils.

Observations of classroom activities of the least and most able pupils indicated a greater degree of differentiation in activities in primary pupils than in the secondary school classrooms. The more able pupils in secondary classes were likely to encounter work which they found undemanding. Discussion with pupils indicated that the pupils were aware of their position in the ability order in the classroom despite teachers' attempts to minimise any labelling by ability. There was some evidence that the more able pupils welcomed opportunities to work independently whilst the least able had a preference for working in a group.

The guidelines on assessment

The principles relating to assessment in 5-14 programme permeate the curriculum guidelines as well as being explicitly laid out in *Assessment 5-14*. Each of the curriculum guidelines contains a section on assessment in its particular content area. Furthermore the whole structure of attainment targets at the five levels is based on the description of pupils' progress in terms of the level criteria. Thus the curriculum guidelines gave teachers access to ideas about assessment within teaching and many teachers were implicitly using these ideas without necessarily recognising that in doing so they were implementing the national guidelines *Assessment 5-14*. Thus teachers' reactions to the assessment guidelines document did not necessarily reflect their reactions to assessment in the 5-14 programme as a whole. It is useful to have this in mind in considering evidence of seemingly slow take up of these guidelines.

Initial reactions in secondary schools were favourable towards the principles in the assessment guidelines and few changes in practice were thought necessary. However by the 1993/94 session the majority of principal teachers recognised that changes of the following kinds were needed:

- more structured record keeping
- more uniformity in assessment methods
- more integration of assessment into planning
- a more child-centred approach to assessment.

These things were already happening in about a quarter of schools and planned in between a half and two thirds of the others, but there were differences between departments in relation to the amount of further change which was needed, with fewer principal teachers of mathematics than principal teachers of English considering this to be necessary.

Secondary teachers' comments indicated that the majority expected there to be more attention to record keeping, more formal assessment and record keeping procedures at the school level, and more emphasis on differentiation. More than half of the English teachers but fewer mathematics teachers also anticipated more pupil self-assessment and building assessment more into lesson planning. This subject difference may be linked with the use of schemes in mathematics with built-in assessment, often including pupil self-assessment, to a far greater extent than in the teaching of English.

The implementation of the assessment guidelines document by primary teachers was also slow to begin and most schools were still at the level of 'awareness-raising' in 1994. Among the reasons for reluctance to take notice of the assessment guidelines was the priority given to the content of the curriculum. This in itself was an indication of what became explicit in many teachers' comments, that assessment was seen as coming at the end of teaching and not at the stages of planning and teaching.

Most secondary school heads of departments recognised that changes in assessment were needed, but differed in the amounts of change they thought were necessary.



Do you think that in your subject there is more to be done and to be gained from using assessment more explicitly in planning, teaching and learning?

Primary school headteachers thought that 5-14 put undue emphasis on written records of pupil progress.



How useful are the written records that you keep? Are there ways of reducing record keeping whilst retaining what is required for planning, deciding next steps and reporting?

The reluctance of primary class teachers to take the assessment guidelines on board was not found among primary headteachers, who, as their secondary counterparts, had formed generally favourable views of the document from the start. They particularly liked the notion of assessment being embedded as a central part of planning, teaching, recording, reporting and evaluating. They were pleased to see the move away from assessment being a separate activity from teaching, which took place subsequent to rather than being part of learning experiences. Among other points welcomed were: the emphasis on pupils self-assessment; the provision of information of increased detail (going beyond 'she's doing well in maths') which would be useful to teachers and parents; the support for pupil profiles; the encouragement for teachers to reflect on their teaching; and the provision of good support materials.

What headteachers disliked about the assessment guidelines included: the fact that they were in a separate document from the curriculum guidelines; the perceived over emphasis on written recording; the absence of examples; and the time they were likely to take to put into practice.

Teachers were aware not only of keeping more records but of keeping more focused records, relating to individual strands within outcomes; they were also extending assessment and record keeping to areas of work, such as PE, in which they had not previously kept records of progress. In some cases the record systems created within schools seemed over-elaborate and were seriously adding to teachers' workloads. No doubt school staff would streamline such procedures in the light of experience, helped by the advice in 5-14: *A Practical Guide* which, as noted earlier, they had not received at the time that these observations were made.

National testing

The revised arrangements, introduced in 1992, made provision for all pupils throughout the age range 5 to 14 to be tested in reading, writing and mathematics when, in their teacher's judgement, they were able to succeed at a particular level. The new arrangements were implemented from January 1993 in primary schools and from January 1994 in secondary schools. When the last of the evaluation data were collected in early 1994, decisions about procedures in secondary schools were still being made, and so no information about secondary school practice can be reported.

Data gathered from primary schools in 1993 indicated teachers' reactions to the revised arrangements. Just under two thirds of headteachers were on the whole satisfied with the new arrangements although voicing some reservations. They approved of the flexibility for teachers to be in control of decisions about when and how pupils were tested. They expected this to enable teachers to integrate the tests into classroom work and so reduce anxiety in the pupils. Other advantages noted by a few were that the tests would confirm teachers' judgements and help them to interpret the levels.

The main disadvantages expressed were concerned with the practicalities of implementation, such as, for example, how decisions about which tests to order would be collated and how teachers would arrange for a few pupils to take tests whilst others continued with regular work. Some headteachers objected to the testing because the tests had no diagnostic value and added nothing to the information about the pupils' achievements. Only a minority of headteachers seemed to have recognised that a major role of tests in the new arrangements was indeed to confirm teachers' judgements. Many class teachers shared these views but others thought that the tests would provide useful back-up to their own assessment and might even boost their confidence in their own judgements. Teachers remained concerned about added workload and some about teaching to the test, although it was difficult to see who would gain if pupils were 'coached' in the test material.

Reporting 5-14

The national guidelines *Reporting 5-14: Promoting Partnership* were published in November 1992, and so no changes could be made in response to the document until the 1993/94 session. Data collected by questionnaire and interviews from teachers and parents in late 1992 and early 1993 established a base-line of views about the current form of reporting, both written and oral, and initial reactions to the new reporting form.

The new form of report was welcomed by the majority of parents, but many shared teachers' views that the amount of work involved in reporting in detail might be detrimental to teaching. This view of reporting being 'extra' to teaching indicated that one of the messages of the reporting guidelines – the wholeness of the relationship between teaching and learning, recording and reporting – had yet to be absorbed. Parents underlined the value of face-to-face meetings with teachers. However schools acknowledged that the difficulties encountered by some parents in attending meetings meant that written reporting would remain the main channel of communication for some.

By the beginning of 1994 there was evidence of changes in reporting taking place, or having been planned, in all primary schools visited in the evaluation. In all cases 5-14 was the catalyst for change, either on the initiative of the headteacher or required by the local authority, but in general the form the change took was a compromise between current practice and that recommended in the guidelines. Planned or implemented changes included: reporting achievement in terms of the structure of outcomes and levels of the 5-14 curriculum; provision for parental comments where this was not already included; suggestions with regard to further development; more written comment, particularly about language development; and, in a minority of schools, provision for pupil comment.

Secondary schools were at an earlier stage in making and planning changes, largely because of the time-lag in implementing 5-14 and the greater complexity

Most headteachers in primary schools were not sure how best to organise National Tests, but wanted them to be built into classroom work.



On the basis of your own experience of, National Testing, what improvements to the process would you suggest?

In both primary and secondary schools, changes in the form of reports to parents tended to be a compromise between current practice and what the guidelines recommend.



Have there been changes to the form of report used in your school? In your view, do these represent an improvement? What are your reasons for thinking this?

Changes to curriculum content in English and mathematics suggested that school staff were trying successfully to match their programmes to the 5-14 guidelines.



How far do you consider that what you now teach gives enough breadth to the curriculum?

Implementing the 5-14 guidelines for English and mathematics initially took a great deal of time.



Will less time be needed to implement the other guidelines? How far will it be possible for schools to keep to the recommended programme of implementation?

of the school structure, but also influenced by the fact that many existing forms of reporting were already structured in a way compatible with 5-14. Where changes were envisaged they were similar to those introduced or planned by primary schools.

Breadth, balance, coherence, continuity and progression

The principles governing the 5-14 curriculum were set out in terms of breadth, balance, coherence, continuity and progression (SOED, 1993). It is appropriate, therefore, that findings of the evaluation should be brought together to shed light on the question as to the extent to which these principles were being translated into practice. Since the whole curriculum was not being implemented at the time of the evaluation study, the answer can only be partial, pointing to indications of positive change and areas where there may have been less change than might have been anticipated.

Breadth in terms of the range of experiences could only be judged in relation to English and mathematics, where implementation was furthest advanced. The evidence of the introduction of new content, changed emphasis in existing content and the acquisition of new resources for teaching in both subjects areas gave clear indication that school staff were making successful efforts to ensure that their programmes were matched to the curriculum guidelines. Schools were making changes as a result of systematic curriculum audit of existing provision in comparison with the guidelines and thus had set into action procedures which should ensure that the guidelines yet to be implemented would be introduced in a way which preserved breadth in pupils' learning experiences.

It is perhaps rather too soon to comment on balance in respect of time allocation across the whole curriculum. It would not have been unreasonable for more time than was intended to be allocated to mathematics and English whilst changes were being made. Balance within the subject areas in terms of the variety of learning activities was clearly being established, as for example, in terms of more time being spent on speaking and listening in English and on problem-solving and information handling in mathematics.

Coherence refers to links between different areas of learning to ensure that they reinforce each other and enable pupils to use their learning in real contexts. The chief mechanism for this in primary schools was topic-based curriculum planning. School staff were using the guidelines in planning their topics to ensure that experiences relating to all outcomes and strands were included whilst preserving the coherence of the topic. There was no evidence that the implementation of 5-14 in secondary schools was making changes to the existing links, or absence of them, between areas of the curriculum.

Continuity of learning experiences at points of transition from school to school is an aspect about which there is reason both for optimism and pessimism about progress. The 5-14 programme had certainly been a stimulus to liaison between primary and secondary school staff and to some extent between nursery and

primary staff. The various effective strategies for improving communication and continuity in the type and level of work across the transition that were being put into place were grounds for optimism. However, in terms of continuity in progress for the individual pupil, the entrenched preference for a 'fresh start' and lack of interest in records and work sent by pupils' previous teachers remain a cause for some concern. Continuity from class to class within a school is likely to be improved by the introduction of school-wide, or departmental, procedures for assessment and recording, although the evaluation did not provide evidence to confirm whether or not this was the case.

Progression at the individual pupil level depends on differentiation within the planned programme which in turn depends upon the integration of assessment into teaching and the full implementation of the assessment guidelines. The evaluation revealed that this process was taking place rather slowly and was probably impeded by teachers associating assessment rather too closely with record keeping and with testing.

However there is encouraging evidence that progression was being facilitated by the use of the 5-14 guidelines in forward planning. Not only were individual teachers applying the progression within strands in their forward planning but there was more whole school or departmental planning, through which gaps and unhelpful repetition were being avoided. The involvement of all schools in primary-secondary liaison was improving continuity at the transition from primary to secondary school.

References

- Harlen, W et al (1994) *Implementing 5-14: A Progress Report*. Interchange 23. Edinburgh: SOED
- Malcolm, H (1995) *Implementing 5-14 in Primary Schools*. Interchange 36. Edinburgh: SOEID
- SED (1987) *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the '90s*. Consultative Paper. Edinburgh: SED
- Simpson, M, Tuson, J and Goulder, J. (1995) *Implementing 5-14 in Secondary Schools*. Interchange 37. Edinburgh: SOEID
- SOED (1994) *5-14: A Practical Guide*. Edinburgh: SOED
- SOED (1994) *Implementing 5-14: A Progress Report by HM Inspectors of Schools*. Edinburgh, SOED

As yet, the evaluation data give no clear evidence of the extent to which continuity and progression at the level of individual pupils were being achieved.



What more needs to be done to help teachers use information from assessment as a basis for next steps?

National guidelines

The following guidelines were published by SOED and copies are available from the Scottish CCC, Gardyne Road, Broughty Ferry, Dundee DD5 1NY.

Assessment 5-14 (1991)

English Language 5-14 (1991)

Environmental Studies 5-14 (1993)

Expressive Arts 5-14 (1992)

Gaelic 5-14 : English version (1993)

Gaidhlig 5-14 : Gaelic version (1993)

Latin 5-14 (1992)

Mathematics 5-14 (1991)

Modern European Languages 5-14 (1992)

Personal and Social Development 5-14 (1993)

Religious and Moral Education 5-14 (1992)

Reporting 5-14 (1992)

Structure and Balance of the Curriculum 5-14 (1993)

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of The Scottish Office Education and Industry Department who funded the study.

Related research reports

Evaluation of the implementation of 5-14: an overview

This report will be available from The Scottish Council for Research in Education, 15 St John Street, Edinburgh EH8 8JR.

Implementing the 5-14 development programme in primary schools

This report will be available from The Scottish Council for Research in Education (address above).

Implementing the 5-14 development programme in secondary schools

The data gathered over the four years of the evaluation of the implementation in secondary schools are collated in the following reports:

<i>Impact on classroom practice in secondary schools</i>	ISBN 1-872054-13-7
<i>Management of the implementation in secondary schools</i>	ISBN 1-872054-14-5
<i>Assessment and national testing in secondary schools</i>	ISBN 1-872054-15-3
<i>Primary/secondary liaison: secondary schools' perspectives</i>	ISBN 1-872054-16-1
<i>The professional journey: A case study of implementation in a secondary school department</i>	ISBN 1-872054-17-X

Copies of these reports can be obtained from the Department of Educational Research, Northern College, Hilton Place, Aberdeen AB9 1FA. Price £5 each. For further information, consult the Northern College World Wide Web server at <http://www.norcol.ac.uk>

5-14 and national testing

5-14 and the least and most able pupils (£6.00 incl p & p)

National testing 1991-92 (£4.00 incl p & p)

Available from Dr George Thomson, Department of Education, University of Edinburgh, 10 Buccleuch Place, Edinburgh EH8 9JT.

5-14 and reporting

Reporting 5-14

This report will be available from Quality in Education Centre, University of Strathclyde, Jordanhill Campus, Southbrae Drive, Glasgow G13 1PP.

The Interchange series

1. Homework Policy and Practice
2. School to Higher Education: Bridging the Gap
3. Teaching, Learning, and Assessment in the National Certificate
4. Developing School Managers
5. Transition from School to Adulthood of Young People with Recorded Special Educational Needs
6. Discipline in Scottish Schools
7. Training the Trainers' Programmes: Effective Management and Monitoring
8. Introduction of the New Further Education College Council System
9. Young People's Experience of National Certificate Modules
10. Costs and Benefits of Adult Basic Education
11. Performance Indicators and Examination Results
12. An Evaluation of the Advanced Courses Development Programme
13. Staying the Course
14. A Study of Probationer Teachers
15. Making School Boards Work
16. Professional Development Through Research
17. Students' Views on SWAP
18. Specific Learning Difficulties: Policy, Practice and Provision
19. Foreign Languages in Primary Schools: the National Pilot Projects in Scotland
20. Towards More School Based Training?
21. Patterns of Attainment in Standard Grade Mathematics 3-6
22. Patterns of Attainment in Standard Grade English 3-6
23. Implementing 5-14: a Progress Report
24. Education-Business Links: Patterns of Partnership
25. Foreign Languages for Vocational Purposes in Further and Higher Education
26. School for Skills
27. Effective Support for Learning: Themes from the RAISE Project
28. Marketing Means Business
29. Adult Education: Participation, Guidance and Progression
30. Studies of Differentiation Practices in Primary and Secondary Schools
31. Health Education: What Do Young People Want To Know?
32. Social and Educational Services for Children Under Five
33. Issues in Teachers' Continuing Professional Development
34. Primary Teachers' Understanding of Concepts in Science and Technology
35. Putting 5-14 in Place: An Overview of the Methods and Findings of the Evaluation 1991-95
36. Implementing 5-14 in Primary Schools
37. Implementing 5-14 in Secondary Schools

Further information

If you have views on *Interchange* and/or wish to find out more about RIU's research programme, contact the Research and Intelligence Unit (RIU), The Scottish Office Education and Industry Department, Room 1-B, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh EH6 6QQ